Appl. No. : **09/669,959**
Filed : **September 26, 2000**

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The Examiner is thanked for the telephonic interview that was conducted on October 11, 2005. During that interview, the impropriety of this Action's finality, as well as the subject matter of the cited prior art, was discussed in detail.

Appl. No. : **09/669,959**
Filed : **September 26, 2000**

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant first requests Withdrawal of the Finality of the Official Action. With all due respect, the final rejection was prematurely made and should be withdrawn.

M.P.E.P 706.07 a states when the final rejection is proper. Specifically, M.P.E.P. 706.07 states that a second or any subsequent action on the merits... "will not be made final if it includes a rejection, on newly cited art... of any claim not amended by applicant... in spite of the fact that other claims may have been amended to require newly cited art". In this case, claim 14 was rejected over a prior art combination including the newly cited reference to Shoff. Claim 14 is an original claim, and was never amended. Therefore, claim 14 was improperly finally rejected. Withdrawal of the finality of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested, for these reasons.

In any case, it is believed that a new Official Action would be appropriate, since the original action which was mailed to the undersigned actually had the wrong substance within the action. The proper action was faxed to the undersigned only a few days ago.

Claim 1 is canceled herein, and claim 2 is amended into independent form. Claim 5 is canceled. Claims 14-16 are canceled.

Claim 21 is amended to include limitations which are comparable to those in claim 2.

Appl. No. : 09/669,959
Filed : September 26, 2000

As explained during the interview, the cited references each relate to displaying Internet content on the same television that displays the hyperlink. Kamada teaches an Internet television apparatus in which a set-top box is used to display Internet content on the television. Shoff teaches an interactive entertainment system in which information from the hyperlinks is used to display information on the television. None of these teach anything about a separate computer used to display the information from the hyperlink. Claim 2 has been amended to include limitations which recite that the separate computer has a separate display from the television display, thus making it more clear that a different display is used - as shown in Figure 1. All of the cited prior art teaches displaying both things: the hyperlink and the Internet content, on the same screen. The present claims define that the content of the hyperlink is sent to a DIFFERENT computer, one that is not the TV. This is not suggested by the prior art. Moreover, this produces an advantage. For example, this enables a separate computer, which is usually used for browsing the Internet, to receive information from the hyperlink on the TV.

Claim 2 should therefore be allowable for these reasons. Claim 3 defines that the information is displayed at a next start up of that separate computer, which is not taught or suggested by anything in the cited prior art.

Claim 8 defines that the hyperlink includes an indication of a referring source. This is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Claim 21 has been amended to include comparable limitations to claim 1, and should be allowable for these reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify

Appl. No. : 09/669,959
Filed : September 26, 2000

agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/10/05

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 678-5082